

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

DETROIT

VOL. XII, No. 8

MAY 12, 1952

\$2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

Two Goals in Foreign Policy

THERE can be very general agreement among the readers of this journal that our nation should have two immediate goals in its foreign policy: (1) the preservation of as large a part of the world as possible from totalitarian rule, and (2) the prevention of general war. Much of the perplexity which we feel arises from the fact that these two goals seem to be in conflict with each other. If we could go all out for one without regard to the other it would seem to be much easier to have "peace of mind."

And yet, though these two goals do seem to conflict in detail, there is a profound sense in which they are actually interdependent. One of the best reasons for not going all out for one in disregard of the other is that in all probability we cannot achieve one without also achieving the other. If Communist totalitarianism should extend its power beyond a certain point—the exact point may be open to debate—it would be almost impossible to prevent general war. One reason for this is that if our nation becomes much more directly threatened than it is now, it is doubtful if it could avoid actions that would lead to a showdown. At this moment the surest way of preventing war is to prevent the extension of Communist power. But if we turn things around, it is even more probable that a general war, a universal atomic war, would leave conditions more favorable for the spread of totalitarianism than for the preservation of freedom. So, while we cannot make any sure statement about the future, it is at least probable that we cannot serve either one of these two goals of policy without serving the other also.

In such a situation as this, with quite common acceptance of both of these objectives by Christians, what is there for which the church can stand that is different from the announced goals of the nation? Sometimes Christians make the mistake of looking for a quite distinctively Christian foreign policy. They may try to find a third goal which as a Christian goal stands above the two that have been men-

tioned. That is a mistaken way of looking for the distinctively Christian contribution to political life. Christians must think and act in the same world with non-Christians and the alternatives which are available to them on the *political* level are not usually different from those available to their fellow citizens. The contribution of the church in such a situation is to help to provide the vision and the moral power necessary to enable the nation as a whole to be true to the best alternative that is available, and to keep that alternative in the right context. At the present time the following contributions which can be made by the church have the greatest importance for the nation.

1. The church should emphasize the second goal, the prevention of general war, when there is a popular tendency to be entirely preoccupied with the first, the prevention of the extension of Communism. There is always the danger that we may be driven into reckless and provocative policies because of the prevalent hysteria. Dr. Frederick Nolde of the World Council of Churches has often reminded the American churches of this danger. He sees that there is a growing intransigence among us that, even if it should be possible to negotiate with the Russians, would prevent us from being morally or politically prepared to make even reasonable concessions. He said in his remarkable speech in Paris at the time of the meeting of the United Nations Assembly: "We must be alert to the danger that our present hardening of attitude will not make it easy for us to comply with the very conditions which we contend Russia must meet." We should avoid illusions about the prospects of successful negotiations, but intransigent refusal to admit the existence of a new and more hopeful situation, if it should arise, might lose an opportunity for peace. The church has a responsibility to keep the nation from forgetting either the moral horror or the futility of a general war. The patient negotiations in Korea, frustrating as they are, do indicate that those who con-

trol our policy and a large part of the American public are well aware that nothing can be gained by extending the war in Korea.

2. Underlying the emphasis upon preventing the war there should be very clear understanding in the church that the military approach to this world conflict is subordinate to the ideological and the social. This journal has constantly stressed this point. But it needs to be repeated because it is only natural for Americans, whose sons are drafted and for whom taxes have become a great burden, to come to believe that what is so costly must be the chief source of strength and security for the nation. And yet that belief is dangerously false. The churches in their corporate statements have been very clear about this since the beginning of the "cold war." There is need of military preparations and there are strategic points at which military power may prevent the advance of Communism. That is in considerable measure true of Europe though, even there, in such countries as Italy and France there seem to be a vulnerability to Communism which no military power by itself can overcome. If Communism wins control of India it will not be because of Red armies but because of propaganda and infiltration which succeed in the absence of any effective alternative program. The success of Communism is due primarily to its capacity to take advantage of the spiritual and political and social weaknesses of its opponents.

3. The churches in America can help our people understand the attitudes of other countries to us. Within the world Christian community frank speaking to one another is possible. The church will have a double task of interpretation and healing in connection with the acute differences that are developing between Americans and the other countries that stand between us and the Iron Curtain. This is becoming a more and more distressing problem. We are in part responsible for the situation and in part it is an inevitable consequence of the concentration of power and wealth in America. In part it is the result of the extraordinary success of Communist propaganda even among people who are opposed to Communism. People in other countries quite naturally fear our power and envy our prosperity. We have more responsibility for our reputation for materialism and for the evidences of a reckless attitude which causes them to fear that we may drag them into a war in which they will be vulnerable to invasion or destruction. Our loose talk about the use of atomic bombs causes the Europeans to fear that they will be the targets for reprisals against us, and

the connection of this talk with China and Korea confirms the deep suspicion in Asia that we would only use the bomb on colored people. The churches can do a great deal to help Americans to understand this antagonism, to face it without resentment in so far as it is unfair and to learn from it where it has some basis, and, above all, to prevent it from controlling our policy. We will be tempted by the fear of this antagonism to accept a new type of isolationism, not the old geographical isolationism but the moral isolationism that prefers to "go it alone" in the way we use our power in all parts of the world.

To hold steady in such a time will require both discipline and far-sighted views in the nation as a whole. It will also require among those whom the churches can best influence the kind of love which understands and cares.

—JOHN C. BENNETT.

Editorial Note

Many of our readers will take satisfaction in the Supreme Court's decision in the New York released time case. This journal was very critical of the McCollum decision. There is a change of emphasis and atmosphere in Justice Douglas' opinion which may not be fully explained by the differences in the circumstances in connection with the New York and the Champaign systems of released time. Take the admission by the majority of the Court that the First Amendment, however, "does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of Church and State." This seems far removed from the very absolutistic talk about a "wall of separation" in the McCollum decision. Also, the objection to aiding any or all religions by the State expressed so emphatically in that decision is different from the statement in this new opinion that "when the State encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions." Justice Douglas recognizes what has been so long accepted as a part of our national tradition that "we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being." The Supreme Court seemed in the case of the Everson decision (New Jersey bus case) and in the McCollum decision to be establishing a trend that had the practical effect of encouraging secularism in the name of the separation of Church and State. That trend seems to have been stopped or perhaps, in some measure, reversed.

J. C. B.

"That All May Be One"

ROBERT McAFEE BROWN

WHEN a scholar and Christian as esteemed and sensitive as Karl Adam* attempts, from a Roman Catholic viewpoint, to deal with the problem of the reunion of Christendom, the first response of the Protestant must be one of gratitude, and willingness to listen. And when he discovers that the plea for reunion is based upon a genuine spiritual dismay at the disruptions of Christendom and an equally genuine religious longing that the body of Christ be restored to unity, he must attempt to reply with something of the tenderness and concern which characterizes almost all of Dr. Adam's book. Almost all—for Dr. Adam does not hesitate, as no good Roman Catholic would hesitate, to point out rather sharp differences between the beliefs of his communion and those which he understands to be the beliefs of the rest of the Christian world. That he does this honestly and humbly is transparently plain, and the Protestant who would reply to him must endeavor to maintain the same spirit even while he will want to disagree rather vigorously with a number of Dr. Adam's characterizations of Protestantism.

I

One thing this book can do for Protestants is to help them see Roman Catholicism a little more clearly from the inside. It is vitally important for us today to see Rome through other than simply non-Roman eyes. If, for example, we cannot accept the Roman dogmas of the immaculate conception or the assumption of the virgin, let alone the infallibility of the Pope, we can at least be helped by Dr. Adam to see why the Roman Christian accepts them. We can see how they are religiously motivated and how they are attempts to preserve the gospel as Rome understands the gospel, that Mariology, for example, is to the Roman simply "applied Christology." (p. 85) We can thus be saved from making facile assertions that Roman Catholicism is simply a feudal structure foisting dogmas on ignorant people out of lust for power and wealth and political influence—an impression that one sometimes gets from such otherwise important and useful books as those of Paul Blanshard. The Protestant can gain from Dr. Adam a most helpful understanding of the religious motivation of Romanism, and even though he may never be able to commit himself to those religious convictions, he can see more clearly why Roman Catholics can.

This is surely a clear gain. For one of the most important steps in understanding a position which one does not accept is to be able to see that position, at least in part, through the eyes of those who do accept it.

II

It is at this point that the Protestant has something to say to the Roman Catholic. For Karl Adam makes a valiant attempt to try to do just what the previous paragraph commends, with regard to the Protestant Reformation, and spends a considerable portion of his book examining the reasons why Luther "left the church." (Ch. II) But this analysis of Luther reveals how near and yet how unutterably far, the most sensitive Roman Catholic mind is from penetrating to the true meaning of Luther and the other reformers. In his very honest and revealing analysis of the corrupt state of medieval Christendom (Ch. I), Dr. Adam wisely confines himself solely to Roman Catholic sources. It is to be feared that he does much the same in his analysis of Luther, even though an occasional name like Troeltsch (whose work on Luther has been far surpassed by recent Protestant scholarship) creeps in. Adam sees certain things about Luther very clearly: that the abuses in the medieval church were merely the occasion and not the cause of the Reformation (p. 30), that Luther was psychologically healthy and not the neurotic that many Roman historians try to make out (p. 33), that Luther's revolt was motivated by religious need and not by dry intellectualism and fusty doctrine (p. 42), and so forth. All this is highly encouraging, so much so that it is doubly disappointing to have it suggested again and again, with one notable exception on p. 47, that "Luther was radically subjectivist" (p. 32), that his experience was "a completely subjective experience" (p. 46), that for Luther and thus for Protestantism the Gospel comes to the *I* and not to the *we*, and to find the idea penetrating again and again throughout the later portions of the book that Protestantism is only subjective individualism.

So it must indeed seem to the Roman Catholic. So it must indeed seem from the outside. But here we Protestants must witness to our Roman brethren from the inside, and insist that we do not accept this as an adequate definition of our faith. Our repudiation of Papal infallibility does not commit us to the theological whim of the moment. We claim to stand within the historic continuity of the body

* Adam, *One and Holy*, Sheed and Ward, 1951, pp. vii and 130.

of Christ through all the ages. The Reformation stands for the recovery of the New Testament gospel by the church; it does not stand for a new religion of "individualism." Nor does our reliance upon the Bible lead merely to subjectivist interpretation. We assert that there is a central and recognizable insistence in the Bible upon God's claim upon man and that we can respond to this claim through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the power of the Holy Spirit. If Roman Catholicism is not so monolithic as we often assume, neither are we quite so diffuse and empty as Romans often assume. Calvin too can say that outside the Church there is no salvation, and Calvin and the sons of Calvin can deplore schism just as heartily as the most correct Roman Catholic. Furthermore this belief in the necessity of the Church, and the possibility that God can speak to the Church through the Bible, is central to a true understanding of the Reformation itself. Let the Roman scholars look at Karl Holl's work on Luther, Watson's *Let God Be God*, Pauck's *The Heritage of the Reformation*, and in some ways most significant of all for an understanding of the early Luther, Gordon Rupp's *Luther's Progress to the Diet of Worms*, and open to revision their conclusion that the Reformation is based chiefly on subjective individualism. It simply is not so.

The Protestant, further, is unwilling to concede that the heritage in which he stands withdrew from the Body of Christ at the time of the Reformation. We are bound to insist that the Reformation was an attempt, in principle successful, to recapture for the Church the lost gospel of the grace of God in Christ Jesus and restore it to the place of centrality which it must have in the life of the worshipping community. Schaff has called this "a deeper plunge into the Gospel." Hugh Kerr, Jr., in his very suggestive *Positive Protestantism*, has aptly characterized the Reformation not as a discovery of something new but as a recovery of something old. There is, then, the Protestant would maintain, a continuity between the early Church and modern Protestantism, a continuity which furthermore is maintained in community, in the life of the Church. Our spiritual origins are not in the sixteenth century, but the first.

This will doubtless seem hard for Roman Catholics to understand, but it is a point they must attempt to understand if we are ever to come closer together.

III

After his discussion of the medieval and Reformation periods, Dr. Adam turns in conclusion to the question "How Is Reunion To Be Achieved?" Once again we see how near, on so many issues, and yet how far, on so many others, are Protestants and Roman Catholics divided in their understanding of one

another. And here is made plain the whole tragedy of the attempt Dr. Adam is making so valiantly throughout the rest of his book. For no matter how much Dr. Adam may try to sympathize with Protestant concerns, there is of course only one way in which he feels—with all Roman Catholics—that reunion is possible. That is on the basis of complete submission to Rome. This is the answer. This is the only hope. The claim is based on the familiar line of argument, that there can be full unity only if the Church stands upon the *one* rock, and the *one* shepherd, who can only be the Bishop of Rome, whose authority is traced back in direct continuity through Peter to Christ. Dr. Adam has a rather strange hope that the "believing Protestant" cannot really doubt the authenticity of Matthew 16:18-19 as it is understood by the Roman, and that he must accept the line of reasoning which says that Christ's charge was transmitted through Peter to his successors. Dr. Adam concedes that the latter point is unBiblical (where he is surely correct) but goes on to suggest that it is "only in this sense that Christianity afterwards understood Jesus' words concerning the rock." (p. 74) Here he is not as surely correct, and the Protestant is puzzled by this, since he is informed by a study of early church history that the words of Jesus to Peter were subjected to varying interpretation by the early Fathers. Schaff, in *The Creeds of Christendom* (Vol. 1, p. 186), for example, points out that the present Roman interpretation of the rock as Peter himself was the exegesis given by seventeen of the early Fathers, while the view that the rock referred to Peter's faith or confession was upheld by no less than forty-four of them. And there were other views as well. This, however, is extremely well-tilled ground in the discussion of Protestant-Roman reunion and will, it must be feared, continue to be a common source of difficulty.

There is a rather less commonly discussed area where further ground needs to be broken on both sides, however. Adam maintains that the whole of revelation, of the legacy of faith, was left not to "literary chance," e.g., to the Scriptures, but to the personal responsibility of the Apostles and their successors. This is the appeal to what is in effect the primacy of tradition over Scripture.

Now one may question not only Adam's contention that the tradition is as clear as the Romans claim it to be (p. 79), but also the assumption that the message of the Bible can be quite so easily made subservient to tradition. What are Protestants to say to this latter point? We have, it seems to me, to say something like this: that "catholicity" or "apostolicity," as the Protestant understands these very important terms, are to be measured by the degree of faithfulness with which the Church main-

tains the witness and testimony of the Apostles to the power of the risen Christ; and that from the Protestant perspective, the touchstone for an understanding of that apostolic message is the Holy Scripture. The authenticity of the Church's message is the degree of its conformity to the *kerygma*, not the degree to which it can be shown to stand in a proper hierarchical succession. The gift of the Apostles to us is not a hierarchy to maintain but a gospel to proclaim, and possession of the former is no necessary guarantee of possession of the latter. This point has been well made by Daniel Jenkins, in a passage which should be pondered by Roman Catholics and Protestants alike.

Since, then, apostolicity is the mark of catholicity, and the Apostle is what he is in virtue of his testimony to the risen Christ, the test of a Church's catholicity is always whether its testimony to Jesus Christ is the same as that of the Apostles, "the eye-witnesses of His majesty." This immediately raises the further question, "What means have we of knowing what the testimony of the Apostles actually was?" And the answer to this question can be given unequivocally. The Apostles themselves took care to ensure that we should be left in no doubt as to the nature of their testimony. They left us the Holy Scriptures. They themselves would pass away and would be unable to exercise their authority in person in our midst any more, but they would leave us their solemn testimony to the words and works, the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ their Lord, and with that in our hands we should be able to discern the truly apostolic preaching from the false and thus the Church of Christ from that of anti-Christ.

(Jenkins, *The Nature of Catholicity*, Faber, p. 28)

The true church therefore exists where this life-giving message is proclaimed. This is what P. T. Forsyth means when he speaks of apostolic succession as being an evangelical rather than a hierarchical succession. And lest it be thought that this conception is merely a "Free Church" view, let the Roman Catholic ponder the very searching examination of the meaning of "bishop" in the writings of Ignatius as set forth by the noted Anglican scholar Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, in *The Fourth Gospel*, where the point is made that "Ignatius speaks of bishops, not as though they were persons exercising some strange kind of independent mystical authority . . . but as men responsible for the preservation of the apostolic witness to Jesus." (p. 104) The test of any bishop, of any presbyter, of any church, is the extent to which he or they "preserve the apostolic witness to Jesus" contained in the Bible.

The Protestant then stands on the claim that the Bible is an authentic preservation of the message of salvation and that faithfulness to this message is the signal mark of the church. It was, in fact, fidelity

to this message which made the Reformation a necessity.

IV

These matters, the Papal claims, and the interpretation of the place of Scripture, are fundamental matters on which Rome and Protestants are very far apart. If, by themselves, they did not make reunion seem dubious, the intransigence of the demands contained in Dr. Adam's concluding chapter would. For in spite of all his attempts to understand the Protestant, he makes it clear that the Roman Church cannot ever make a single concession concerning its claim about itself. "The Catholic Church feels and knows herself as the Church of Christ in the emphatic exclusive sense. For her there is only one true union, reunion with herself." (p. 93) Rome must condemn all other churches "as extra-Christian and indeed un-Christian and anti-Christian creations." (p. 93) Dr. Adam will concede that "our unhappy divisions" (to use a favorite phrase of certain Anglicans, who are sometimes almost as intransigent themselves) are partly the historical result of Roman errors (p. 97) but it is only by a return to Rome that the situation can be repaired.

The "return to Rome" is for true Protestants unthinkable, not because we nourish grudges growing out of medieval abuses or the Inquisition or post-Tridentine inflexibility, but simply because we feel that Rome makes claims for herself which represent the utmost in spiritual pride. The Roman Church, as a vehicle of salvation, claims to manipulate that salvation; the Pope, who to the Roman Christian indeed is a servant of the gospel, becomes to the Protestant Christian one who acts as the master of the gospel; the church by equating its voice with the voice of God, is no longer open to the cleansing power of the judgment of God upon it in its highest reaches, which is just where the judgment of God should be looked for most searchingly. The Protestant who seriously believes that no human institution and no human person can dare presume to speak in the infallible accent of the Holy Ghost, must forever resist this claim. There is thus no final possibility of reunion on Dr. Adam's terms, and it is well that Protestants be aware of just what his terms are, since they are in actuality not his terms at all but the unqualified demands of His church.

V

We need not, however, put down his book with a feeling of impatience or exasperation. For he does show us that we must love and understand one another even if we must disagree. For his Roman Catholic readers, he lays down three basic principles which must underlie attempts at mutual understand-

ing, and in doing this he speaks to Protestants as well.

1. There is first the necessity of "taking one's own Confession seriously." (p. 103) We must not water down each other's faith in an attempt to reach false unity. He even goes so far as to state that if a man attains clarity of religious conviction outside of Rome, he must in good conscience stay outside of Rome, though he later vitiates this noble declaration by asking to what extent it is really possible to attain vitality and firmness of faith within Protestantism. (p. 115) On the repeated misunderstanding of Protestantism as "subjectivism" (pp. 115-116), he makes it clear that only within the Roman Church can true religion flourish. Let us therefore, as Protestants, do precisely as Dr. Adam suggests, and by "taking our own Confession seriously" show that this is not so.

2. He also points out that unity is a religious concern, which cannot be pursued for political, cultural, aesthetic, or romantic reasons. Here the Protestant must surely concur. And the Ecumenical movement which has arisen as a witness to Protestant concern in this matter must always be challenged to keep its motives pure. It is Christ's prayer "that all may be one" which must motivate us, rather than spurious pleas for "efficiency" or "impressiveness."

3. Finally, Dr. Adam pleads with his Roman Catholic brethren "to soften the antagonism that exists between believers of the two Churches." (p. 108) That Protestants must accept a measure of blame for this is evident, though it can be questioned whether Protestant scholarship "is characterized by a much more savage tone than corresponding Catholic literature." (p. 109) Surely, however, we are challenged to avoid the very cheap polemic which engages so many second-rate Protestant minds, and to become in our Protestant assertions something more than anti-Catholics. Firm in this resolve we can at the same time hope that there will be less of the perverse distortion of our faith which characterizes, for example, the discussion of Luther by Maritain, the Roman Catholic philosopher, in *Three Reformers*.

Disagreement between Protestants and Roman Catholics will continue, however, and we must not pull our punches for the sake of artificial harmony. We can, however, exercise the kind of prudence and restraint which for the most part Dr. Adam exhibits in his book, in an effort to come into closer understanding with our Roman Catholic brethren. Let us continue to speak the truth, and the truth for us will involve constant disagreement with many fundamental aspects of Roman Catholicism, but let us endeavor, after the manner of Dr. Adam himself, to speak the truth in love.

Correspondence

Dear Sir:

... The subject treated in the editorial, "Whither The National Council?"—January 7, 1952, is of such great importance that it deserves careful comment and analysis.

First, let me make it very clear that I share the basic concern which Dr. Bennett revealed in his editorial. I am confident that many others of the members of the General Board agree with Dr. Bennett that there is a danger "that the prophetic leadership of the Churches, which was one of the great contributions of the Federal Council of Churches, may not be allowed to appear in this new structure."

However, I have a further concern which Dr. Bennett does not seem fully to share; in any case he does not list it as one of the reasons for the cautious policy which the General Board of the National Council has been so far following. This concern is that the new National Council of Churches shall become a wiser and more effective mold of church and public opinion than the Federal Council, despite all its courage and freedom, was ever able to become.

There is an implication in Dr. Bennett's editorial that the criticism of the Federal Council, which was quite general and severe, was wholly undeserved. I do not believe that this can be supported from the record, even though I am sure any thoughtful Christian should repudiate the unfair and conscienceless attacks made upon the Federal Council by such critics as Flynn and McCarthy.

In his editorial Dr. Bennett underlines the dangers of the typical priestly sins of compromise and time serving. But, he does not, it appears to me, sufficiently recognize the danger of the equally abhorrent and typical sins of the prophet which are those of pride and arrogance. One of the hopes I have for the new National Council is that it may be able to develop procedures which will allow it in the long run to be more creative in its influence than the Federal Council ever was. This will happen only if the new National Council listens to and heeds not only the voices of the prophets among us, but also the voices of wise men and practical who do not always agree with the prophets. But these latter may not be judged a priori to be wrong. Dr. Bennett's practical suggestion of making "distinctions between what is said by the Council as a whole to the nation, and what is said either by a responsible unit of the Council on its own behalf to the Churches, or by a conference called for a specific purpose which speaks for itself to the Churches" seems to me eminently sound. As I understand the present situation in the National Council, it is these distinctions, plus some others, with which the General Board is now struggling.

It is just as important to the long range influence of the National Council that adequate safeguards and discipline be developed as it is that adequate freedom be preserved. My own fear is that impatience and pride on the part of either the more liberal or the more conservative of the Council's constituencies may lead them to give up their hope for the National Council before

God has had a chance through His spirit to teach us to learn sufficiently from one another. I am as fearful of the arrogance of the liberal as I am of the machinations of the conservative. I have as much confidence in the integrity and honesty of the conservative as I have in the courage and honesty of the liberal. Hope lies in the creative combination in the National Council of a larger cross section of Christian faith and conviction than has been anywhere available to the American Churches heretofore.

Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, Stated Clerk,
The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

News and Notes

National Council Laymen Meet

The National Laymen's and Laywomen's Committee of the National Council of Churches met at Princeton, New Jersey on April 5th and 6th with co-chairmen J. Howard Pew, Presbyterian layman and a director of the Sun Oil Company, and Mrs. Lois B. Hunter presiding. The morning session featured "A Review of the National Council's First Year" by Dr. Samuel McCrae Cavert and Dr. Roy G. Ross. In the afternoon Mr. Pew and Mr. Wilbur LaRoe, Jr., spoke on the work of laypeople in the Council and the denominations, followed by a panel on "Religion in Public Education," with Dr. Luther A. Weigle, Dr. Gerald E. Knoff and Dr. Eugene Youngert.

The evening speakers were Dr. Vernon Orval Watts, of Claremont, California, who spoke on "The Meaning of Freedom," Dr. Howard E. Kerschner, editor of *Christian Economics* which is the publication of the Christian Freedom Foundation, whose subject was "God, Gold and Government," and Dr. Howard F. Lowry, President of the College of Wooster. On Sunday Congressman Walter H. Judd preached a sermon on "The Ten Commandments," which was followed in the afternoon by an executive session which was not open to the public.

The keynote of the meeting was sounded by Mr. Pew in his Saturday afternoon address on "Laypeople at Work in the National Council." He expressed concern that laypeople have been inactive in the church, leaving its witness in social and economic matters to the clergy who are really not qualified to deal with them. An example of this is the fact that National Council social pronouncements have been "Socialistic" and the work of a very small group.

He went on to urge the members of this committee, who have been promised seats on all key Council committees, to be faithful in attending meetings and in working for the adoption of the "right" kind of pronouncements. He reported that the Council had promised this committee, as an inducement to service, that no Council committee report would be published until it had been approved by the General Board. Mr. Pew outlined three areas to which the laypeople should give their attention: 1) Religion in public education, 2) An effective program of education to convince people of the complete inter-

dependence of freedom and Christianity, 3) Evangelism.

Mr. Pew was followed by Wilbur LaRoe, Jr., former Moderator of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. and prominent Washington, D. C. attorney, speaking on "Laypeople at Work in the Denominations." He maintained that the church is not measuring up to the challenge of today. The thing at stake is nothing less than Christian civilization. Ministers are not aware of the danger and continue to preach "conventional sermons" while laymen are not displaying the kind of discipleship the situation demands. What is required is not a "flirtation with new ideas" but a return to the Bible and a stern morality and to the leadership of committed men. This calls for the education of laymen in the meaning of their faith, of which Mr. LaRoe says they are woefully ignorant, and for getting them to realize the danger to freedom and the consequent demand for better discipleship.

The discussion following these two addresses centered mainly upon how this committee could secure the appointment by the denominations of "our variety of people" to the National Council committees.

In the evening Dr. Watts spoke on "The Meaning of Freedom." He argued that freedom is the absence of interference, the absence of violence and the fulfillment of contract. The fruit of these conditions is competition which, instead of being the law of the jungle, leads to the practice of the Golden Rule as the means by which the co-operation of others is secured. Capitalism, so understood, is indispensable to freedom.

The function of government is to curb, not to use, violence in economic life. It should keep hands off the economy. The instability of our system since 1796 has been the direct result of government interference with currency and banking. It has not been created by anything in the nature of capitalism. Labor troubles are the result of the use of violence by unions. Apart from their use of violence unions could not exist. If enough people will come to abhor this use of violence and return to the teachings of Jesus, everything will be all right.

"God, Gold and Government" was the topic of the editor of *Christian Economics*. According to Mr. Kerschner, it is an error to argue that the "miracle of America" is due to the abundance of natural resources. Our country was settled by people whose primary interest was not economic but religious. Our freedom is rooted in the Christian faith. But faith must be supplemented by knowledge, by "know-how" in the form of a sound currency, i.e. the gold standard. No civilization has lasted more than forty-two years without "trusted money," and we are nineteen years gone already. Only sound currency can produce faith in a long-term future and thus produce effort and integrity. Limited government is the third condition of freedom. We must choose between freedom with no government control in economic life and government control with the loss of freedom and the franchise.

Dr. Lowry, who abandoned his prepared address at the last minute and spoke extemporaneously, cited William Ernest Hocking to the effect that democracy is hard to achieve because it demands a maximum of self-realization with a minimum of self-interest. He pointed

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

M. SEARLE BATES	LISTON POPE
JOHN C. BENNETT	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	AMOS N. WILDER
GLOSTER MONK, <i>Secretary</i>	

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	HENRY SMITH LEIPER
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	JOHN A. MACKAY
CHARLES W. GILKEY	FRANCIS P. MILLER
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	EDWARD L. PARSONS
UMPHREY LEE	

out that one of the greatest dangers to democracy is the discovery by social scientists of techniques to manipulate the masses of the people. Our greatest freedom, he maintained, is the freedom to accept the miracle of Jesus Christ.

Distributed at the meeting was a pamphlet entitled "Gaining the Clergyman's Understanding." Parts of this pamphlet were also incorporated in the work-book which was the basis of the conference program. This pamphlet emphasized, on the basis of a public opinion poll, that ministers are not socialistic but that a large minority do not "as long as companies compete fairly there is no such thing as too big a profit in the moral sense." This interesting pamphlet shows how best to

Detroit Public Library
Book Receiving
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-53

approach the minister in order to convince him that "companies live by moral rules of the game" and that "profits serve the many, and not the few."

Dibelius Assails

East German Communists

Berlin (RNS)—Practices of the East German Communist government were assailed here by Bishop Otto Dibelius of Berlin, chairman of the Council of the Evangelical Church in Germany, as destructive to Christian life in the Soviet Zone.

"Complete revolutionizing of all living conditions is taking place in eastern Germany," he told a conference here of 400 West German Evangelical pastors. "In this process, the new Communist State has not overlooked any layer of the population nor any profession."

The materialistic ideology being hammered into the East German people through "countless" indoctrination courses is causing "extreme distress" to Christian families, Bishop Dibelius said. He added that the school system in the Soviet Zone "can only be described as a martyrdom" of parents and children.

"Such a political monomania as that prevailing in East Germany also implies disapprobation of the Church's spiritual care and missionary work," he said, "since the Communist State knows only political aims and motives."

Bishop Dibelius said that tradition developed through centuries of German history are being destroyed in this development "since every totalitarian State feels itself authorized to regard its own assumption of power as the beginning of a new historical era."

British Council Asks

Race Partnership in Africa

Belfast, Northern Ireland (RNS)—The British Council of Churches, meeting here, approved a statement of its international department that the prosperity of native territories in Central Africa "must not be sought by domination of either Africans or Europeans nor by race segregation, but through partnership."

Fear and mistrust between racial groups "of which there are increasing signs," the statement said, must be removed.

Individuals and local church groups were urged to make known to members of Parliament their "grave disquiet at the deterioration of interracial confidence" resulting from current discussions on plans for a Central African federation embracing Nyasaland, Northern Rhodesia, and Southern Rhodesia.

The statement called upon church groups "to make clear their opposition to any plan contrary to the wishes of the majority of those concerned."

The church leaders said that Christians can best promote "a real partnership" of races in Central Africa by supporting the work of the churches there, and "by prayers, gifts, and service."

Author in This Issue

Robert McAfee Brown is Professor and head of the Department of Religion, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota.